UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,727	08/27/2001	Seiji Sugimura	1614.1182	2759
21171 STAAS & HA	7590 04/17/2007		EXAMINER	
SUITE 700			LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE	
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		2161	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/17/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/938,727	SUGIMURA, SEIJI			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
	·	Etienne P LeRoux	2161			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communica or Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address			
THE   - External after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) disperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutore to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, reply received by the Office later than three months after and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- cation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty ory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON' by statute, cause the application to become AB/	eply be timely filed  (30) days will be considered timely.  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on <u>19 March 2007</u> .				
2a)	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)	∑ This action is non-final.				
3)						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims	·				
4) 🖂	Claim(s) 1-3,6-10,13-18,21-23 and 30-	34 is/are pending in the application	n.			
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are	•				
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
•—	6) Claim(s) 1-3,6-10,13-18,21-23 and 30-34 is/are rejected.					
•	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
• —	Claim(s) are subject to restrictio	n and/or election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
		Evaminar				
,—	The specification is objected to by the E		jected to by the Examiner			
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>27 August 2001</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
11)	The oath of declaration is objected to by	y the Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action of John 1-10-102.			
Priority (	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
-	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority do		mulication No.			
	•	cuments have been received in A				
	•	the priority documents have been	received in this National Stage			
* (	application from the International	•	received			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
•		:	•			
Attachmen	t(s)	•				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date.						
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT		oformal Patent Application (PTO-152)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 09/938,727

Art Unit: 2161

#### Claim Status:

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-18, 21-23 and 30-34 are pending; claims 4, 5, 11, 12, 19, 20 and 24-29 having been cancelled. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-18, 21-23 and 30-34 are rejected as detailed below.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 6,338,138 (Raduchel et al), hereafter Raduchel, in view of US Pat No 5,937,346 (Ono), hereafter Ono.

### Claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 15, 16, 18, 21, 23 and 30-34:

Raduchel as admitted prior art (RAPA) discloses:

a storage unit [stand-alone computer, col 1, lines 20-30]

a processor [stand-alone computer, col 1, lines 20-30]

RAPA discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose detecting a password input error at the client-side information processing apparatus. Raduchel discloses detecting a password input error at the client-side information processing apparatus [authentication fails, col 5, lines 45-65]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2161

the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include detecting a password input error at the client-side information processing apparatus as taught by Raduchel for the purpose of preventing a user from accessing network resources such as files, col 5, lines 60-65]. Furthermore, the combination of RAPA and Raduchel discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose registering information identifying the client-side information processing apparatus in a first database of the registration center when the password input error is detected. One discloses registering information identifying the client-side information processing apparatus in a first database of the registration center when the password input error is detected [Fig 1, 10]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include registering information identifying the client-side information processing apparatus in a first database of the registration center when the password input error is detected as taught by One for the purpose of confirming password input errors [col 2, lines 55-60].

Furthermore, the combination of RAPA, Raduchel and One discloses

storing transmission log information related to the registration in the registration center into said storage unit of said client-side information processing apparatus [Fig 1, 10]

Claims 2, 9 and 17:

The combination of RAPA, Raduchel and ONO discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above and furthermore discloses wherein said processing part includes means for transmitting to a second database of the registration center if the transmission log information is stored in said storage unit, and for making a system lock with respect to the information processing apparatus if the information related to the information processing apparatus is

Art Unit: 2161

registered in the first database or the second database [Raduchel, user access is restricted, col 5, lines 45-65]

# Claims 3 and 10:

The combination of RAPA, Raduchel and ONO discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above and furthermore discloses wherein said processing part includes means for outputting a warning if the information related to the information processing apparatus is registered in the second database [Raduchel; Fig 5, col 5, lines 45-55]

# Claims 7, 14 and 22:

The combination of RAPA, Raduchel and ONO discloses wherein said processing part includes means for deleting the information related to the first apparatus from said first database and/or said second database when a request to delete the information related to the first apparatus is received with respect to said first database and/or said second database, in response to the transmission from the second apparatus [Ono; col 6, lines 15-25].

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/19/2007 have been fully considered but they are moot based on above new grounds of rejection resulting from applicant's amendments.

### Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne P LeRoux whose telephone number is (571) 272-4022. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 am and 4:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2161

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on (571) 272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Etienne LeRoux

4/10/2007

Etienne Plekociet formany escaminer